

If the mask fits: Psychological correlates with online self-presentation experimentation in adults

Chris Fullwood*¹, Caroline Wesson¹, Josephine Chen-Wilson², Melanie Keep³, Titus Asbury⁴
& Luke Wilsdon¹

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Wolverhampton, UK

² Faculty of Health and Society, University of Northampton, UK

³ Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, Australia

⁴ Department of Psychology and Philosophy, Texas Woman's University, USA

**Corresponding author*

Dr Chris Fullwood

Department of Psychology

Faculty of Education, Health and Wellbeing

University of Wolverhampton

West Midlands

WV1 1LY, UK

E-mail: c.fullwood@wlv.ac.uk

Running title: Psychological links with online self-presentation

Key words: impression management, self-presentation, social anxiety, self-concept clarity, self-monitoring

Abstract

Online self-presentation refers to the ways in which individuals share aspects of the self to portray a particular image. Being online presents opportunities for individuals to experiment with different versions of the self as part of identity development, but also to manage how others perceive them. Research has shown that personality can influence online self-presentation behaviours, but these studies have chiefly focused on internal characteristics, and more research is needed exploring the relational facets of personality. This study aims to investigate the extent to which an individual's self-concept clarity, self-monitoring tendency, self-esteem, and social anxiety predict different presentations of the online self. A cross-sectional online survey was conducted with 405 adult participants from Australia, the UK, and USA. Results show that individuals with higher self-concept clarity and self-monitoring are more likely to present a single consistent online and offline self. Younger adults and those with greater social anxiety are more likely to present idealised self-images online, and participants with higher social anxiety and lower self-esteem are more likely to prefer online, rather than offline, communication. Findings are broadly consistent with the literature, and suggest the need for more systematic investigation into a variety of personality variables that take into account the relational nature of identity formation and impression management. This research emphasises the multi-faceted nature of online self-presentation behaviours, and the ways in which they are differentially influenced by personality variables.

Introduction

Cyberspace offers unique opportunities for individuals to experiment with self-presentation¹. In many online spaces, individuals can be more deliberate in how they present themselves to others, for example intentionally posting certain content, editing existing information so that it is 'just right' or deleting content that shows them unfavourably². This notion of malleable and audience-driven self-presentation aligns with Goffman's dramaturgical analogy of impression management, which argues that an awareness of being evaluated by others prompts different types of tailored performances in order to project desirable self-images. The 'actor' will wear the 'mask' most appropriate to the communication context they find themselves in³. Different online audiences and contexts may also require careful curating of the self so individuals can mould their self-presentation to fit in to any online context they wish⁴. Thus, the nature of cyberspace allows for considerable flexibility in impression management^{5,6,7}, but also provides opportunities to achieve optimal self-presentation via its various affordances, for example asynchronicity and anonymity^{8,9}.

Despite these opportunities, not all who go online take advantage of them. For the most part, the self that individuals present online deviates little from their offline self^{6,10,11,12,13,,14}. For those who do experiment with different forms of self-presentation, personality is said to play an important role^{5,15,16}. Previous studies have found that self-concept clarity, or the degree to which individuals feel their self-concept is "clearly and confidently defined, internally consistent, and temporally stable" (Campbell et al.¹⁷, p.141), is a significant predictor of online self-presentation experimentation in both adolescents¹¹ and young adults¹⁸. In adolescents, lower self-concept clarity is associated with a preference for presenting the self online, more idealised online self-presentations, and more diverse self-presentations across multiple online platforms¹¹. Those with higher self-concept clarity however, tend to display an online self which is more consistent with their offline self¹¹. The authors argue that these forms of self-presentation may be an act of self-discovery¹¹, consistent with observations that adolescents perceive social media and other online spaces as "tools" to experiment with different self-presentations¹⁹.

Although much research into identity formation has focused on adolescence, a period characterised by self-discovery²⁰, self-presentation concerns do nonetheless extend beyond adolescence and are also important in adulthood²¹. Evidence suggests that adults are prone

to explore and manipulate their online self-presentation⁶, with lower self-concept clarity again predictive of more diverse self-presentations¹⁸. However, in adults, higher self-concept clarity did not predict a consistent online and offline self¹⁸. Whilst it is argued that this may be due to differences in online behaviours of 'digital natives', online self-presentation may also be related to other relational facets of personality such as self-monitoring, self-esteem and social anxiety. Some individuals may use the online world in a compensatory manner to express a side of the self which they feel less capable of expressing offline².

Self-monitoring is closely linked to self-presentation^{22,23,24} and involves regulating one's behaviour to present oneself favourably to others²³. High self-monitors adapt their self-presentation in relation to social and situation cues for the sake of creating and maintaining desired, or perceived to be desired, public appearances²⁵. Low self-monitors however tend to present more accurate versions of the self, conveying authentic attitudes, values and beliefs²³. On social media sites, high self-monitoring predicts risky online behaviour (e.g. posting sexually provocative images), arguably because this behaviour is deemed the 'norm' on such sites. High self-monitors may present themselves as 'cool' due to their desire to receive favourable reactions²⁶. Research also suggests that there are potentially numerous negative personal outcomes for those who self-monitor more abundantly, including being more sensitive to social pressures and making poorer impression formation decisions, which may ultimately impact on their own and others' wellbeing (e.g. see Kudret et al.²⁷, for a review).

People's fundamental "need for self-esteem" (Schlenker²⁸, p. 88) and their desire to maintain or increase a positive view of themselves may also be related to self-presentation. People with low self-esteem tend to have neutral, ambivalent or conflicting views of themselves²⁹. They tend to be cautious in their self-presentation, unwilling to risk presenting themselves in ways that may contradict how they think others perceive them³⁰. Thus, they would avoid making unfavourable impressions rather than trying, and risk failing, to make favourable impressions¹⁶. For instance, when individuals are faced with a situation that poses an interpersonal risk (e.g. embarrassment or rejection), low self-esteem individuals prefer to communicate via email than face-to-face due to the greater level of control over self-presentation it affords³¹. In contrast, high self-esteem individuals are less concerned about

occasionally making unfavourable impressions, because they feel more accepted by others, and are thus more likely to take self-presentation risks¹⁶.

On social media, people with low self-esteem are more likely to engage in false or inauthentic self-presentation^{6,32}, while higher self-esteem is associated with authentic self-presentation³². False self-presentation may not necessarily be an act of deception however, but may also reflect exploration of the self, trying out different personas or presenting multiple selves⁶. Conversely, Kramer and Winter³³ found no effect of self-esteem on self-presentation on social media. Thus, more research is needed to explore the relationship between online self-presentation experimentation and self-esteem.

Closely related to self-esteem and self-presentation is social anxiety. People who are socially anxious tend to be uncertain about making positive impressions on others¹⁶. Social anxiety has been found to be positively related to self-presentation on Facebook³⁴, with inauthentic self-presentation consistently associated with high social anxiety³². People who experience social anxiety frequently demonstrate a preference for online, compared to face-to-face, communication^{35,36} due to the increased control, and opportunities for self-presentation online^{2,33}.

Previous studies have demonstrated that self-concept clarity is an important predictor of online self-presentation experimentation^{11,18}. However, the role that other related aspects of personality have on online self-presentation experimentation have not been fully considered alongside self-concept clarity, and are important for understanding the ways in which cyberspace is used in identity formation. Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to test whether self-concept clarity, self-monitoring, self-esteem, and social anxiety can predict various types of online self-presentation behaviour in adults. It is predicted that:

H1: Idealised online self-presentation will be associated with lower self-concept clarity, higher self-monitoring and higher social anxiety.

H2: More diverse online self-presentations will be associated with lower self-concept clarity and lower self-esteem.

H3: A more consistent presentation of the self between offline and online will be associated with higher self-concept clarity and higher self-esteem.

H4: A preference for presenting the self online will be associated with lower self-concept clarity, higher social anxiety and lower self-esteem.

Method

Participants

An opportunity sample of four-hundred and five participants (340 female, 63 male, 2 transgender) were recruited into the study. The study was advertised on the participant pools of each of the host institutions in Australia, the UK and USA, as well as being promoted on social media (e.g. Twitter) by researchers at each institution. Participants ranged from 18 to 72 years old ($M=23.29$ years, $sd = 8.31$).

Materials

The survey consisted of 73 questions asking participants about their sex, age, tendency for self-monitoring, self-esteem, social anxiety, self-concept clarity, and presentation of online self. *The Self-Concept Clarity Scale*¹⁷ is a 12-item scale that assesses consistency, stability and confidence of self-beliefs and is rated on a 5-point Likert scale (“strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”). Sample items include: “My beliefs about myself often conflict with one another” and “Even if I wanted to, I don't think I could tell someone what I'm really like.” A mean score is calculated from the 12 items and higher scores indicate a more consistent and stable self-concept. The scale has high reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.86$)^{17,37}.

The 15-item *Interaction Anxiousness Scale*³⁸ measures an individual's social anxiety, and is reported to have high reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .87$ to $.89$)^{38,37}. Items are rated on a 5-point scale (“not at all characteristic of me” to “extremely characteristic of me”). Sample items include: “I wish I had more confidence in social situations” and “I often feel nervous even in casual get-togethers.” A mean score is calculated from the 15 items and higher scores indicate a higher level of social anxiety.

*The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*³⁹ consists of 10 items that provide an overall evaluation of one's perceived worth or value and is rated on a 4 point scale (“strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”). Sample items include: “I certainly feel useless at times” and “I wish I could have more respect for myself.” A total score is obtained by summing the 10 items and higher scores indicate higher level of self-esteem. The scale has high reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = .77$)^{39,37}.

*The Self-Monitoring Scale*⁴⁰ consists of 13 items, rated on a 6 point Likert scale (“strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”), that measure an individual’s tendency to modify how they are perceived by others. Sample items include: “I am often able to read people’s true emotions correctly through their eyes” and “When I feel that the image I am portraying isn’t working, I can readily change it to something that does.” A mean score is calculated from the 13 items. High self-monitors modify their behaviour more in relation to situational cues and have higher scores on this scale. The scale has high reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .75$)^{40,37}.

*The Presentation of Online Self Scale (POSS)*¹¹ contains 21 items rated on a 5-point scale (“strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) and measures different types of online self-presentation behaviour. The scale includes the following four factors: a) Ideal Self, which measures the extent to which individuals present an idealised version of the self while online (e.g. “I can show my best qualities online”), b) Multiple Selves, which measures the extent to which individuals present multiple versions of the self across different online platforms (e.g. “I enjoy acting out different identities online”), c) Consistent Self, which measures the extent to which individuals present an online self that is consistent with their offline self-presentation (e.g. “I feel my personality online is the real me”), and d) Online Presentation Preference, which measures the extent to which individuals prefer to present themselves online (e.g. “I prefer being online than offline”). Each of the four factors is calculated taking the mean score for the associated items. The scale has moderate to high reliability with Cronbach’s alpha scores of .86 for Ideal Self, .85 for Multiple Selves, .62 for Consistent Self and .72 for Online Presentation Preference. Reliability scores in the current study were also moderate to high: Ideal Self (.80), Multiple Selves (.86), Consistent Self (.65) and Online Presentation Preference (.65)^{11,37}.

Procedure

Upon recruitment participants were provided with a link to the online study, hosted on Qualtrics. After gaining informed consent and providing demographic information, participants were asked to complete the assessment measures described above. Participants were debriefed with regard to the aims of the study upon completion and provided with contact details for the researchers.

Results

Correlations

See Table 1 for bivariate correlations (Pearson) between all of the variables of interest in the study. All variables were significantly inter-correlated, except for age with consistent self and ideal self with self-monitoring.

Table 1: Summary statistics (mean and standard deviation) and correlational statistics for the POSS factors and other variables of interest

	Mean (SD)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
(1) Consistent self	3.52 (.685)	1.00								
(2) Ideal self	2.82 (.648)	-.272**	1.00							
(3) Multiple selves	1.99 (.805)	-.373**	.593**	1.00						
(4) Online preference	2.39 (.760)	-.274**	.493**	.452**	1.00					
(5) Self-concept clarity	2.87 (.659)	.194**	-.392**	-.303**	-.280**	1.00				
(6) Self-monitoring	3.66 (.455)	.191**	-.064	-.160**	-.300**	.123*	1.00			
(7) Self-esteem	28.43 (5.17)	.174**	-.318**	-.286**	-.346**	.588**	.191**	1.00		
(8) Interaction anxiety	3.04 (.739)	-.177**	.365**	.214**	.416**	-.450**	-.273**	-.438**	1.00	
(9) Age	23.29 (8.31)	-.024	-.239**	-.101*	-.146**	.331**	.103*	.193**	-.280**	1.00

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Four 2-stage hierarchical regression analyses were conducted with ideal self, multiple selves, consistent self and online presentation preference as the separate dependent variables. To control for age, this variable was entered on its own at stage one. Self-concept clarity, self-monitoring, self-esteem and social anxiety were introduced at stage two.

Ideal self

At stage one, age contributed significantly to the regression model ($F(1, 399) = 25.106$, $p < 0.01$) and accounted for 5.9% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .057$) for ideal self. Introducing self-concept clarity, self-monitoring, self-esteem and social anxiety explained an additional 14.9% of the variance ($R^2 = .208$; adjusted $R^2 = .198$) and this change was significant ($F(5, 395) = 20.743$, $p < 0.01$). When all five independent variables were included at stage 2, age (Beta = $-.099$, $t = -2.07$, $p < 0.05$), self-concept clarity (Beta = $-.224$, $t = -3.79$, $p < 0.01$) and social anxiety (Beta = $.208$, $t = 3.89$, $p < 0.01$) were significant predictors. Younger adults, those with

a less clear self-concept and those with higher levels of social anxiety were more likely to indicate expressing an idealised version of the self online.

Multiple selves

At stage one, age contributed significantly to the regression model ($F(1, 399) = 4.509, p < 0.05$) and accounted for 1.1% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .009$) for multiple selves. Introducing the other variables explained an additional 10.8% of the variance ($R^2 = .119$; adjusted $R^2 = .108$) and this change was significant ($F(5, 395) = 10.702, p < 0.01$). When all five independent variables were included at stage 2, self-concept clarity (Beta = $-.204, t = -3.28, p < 0.01$), self-monitoring (Beta = $-.103, t = -2.08, p < 0.05$) and self-esteem (Beta = $-.127, t = -2.10, p < 0.05$) were significant predictors. Adults with a less clear self-concept, lower self-esteem and who engaged in less self-monitoring were more likely to indicate experimenting with the presentation of multiple selves while online.

Consistent self

At stage one, the model which included age only was non-significant for consistent self ($F(1, 399) = 0.303, p = .582$). Introducing the other variables explained an additional 8.6% of the variance ($R^2 = .087$; adjusted $R^2 = .076$) and this change was significant ($F(5, 395) = 7.561, p < 0.01$). When all five independent variables were included at stage 2, age (Beta = $-.127, t = -2.46, p < 0.05$), self-concept clarity (Beta = $.160, t = 2.52, p < 0.05$) and self-monitoring (Beta = $.166, t = 3.31, p < 0.01$) were significant predictors. Younger adults, those with a clearer self-concept and those who self-monitored more frequently were more likely to present an online self consistent with offline self-presentation.

Online presentation preference

At stage one, age contributed significantly to the regression model ($F(1, 399) = 9.413, p < 0.01$) and accounted for 2.3% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .021$) for online presentation preference. Introducing the other variables explained an additional 21.3% of the variance ($R^2 = .236$; adjusted $R^2 = .226$) and this change was significant ($F(5, 395) = 24.352, p < 0.01$). When all five independent variables were included at stage 2, self-monitoring (Beta = $-.194, t = -4.23, p < 0.01$), self-esteem (Beta = $-.164, t = -2.92, p < 0.01$) and social anxiety (Beta = $.267, t = 5.08, p < 0.01$) were significant predictors. Adults with lower self-esteem, higher social anxiety

and who self-monitor less frequently were more likely to indicate a preference for presenting the self online.

Discussion

Identity formation and impression management happen at the intersection of intrapersonal characteristics and interpersonal contexts. This study was the first to explore the relationship between self-concept clarity, self-monitoring, self-esteem, and social anxiety on different types of online self-presentation behaviours. Broadly consistent with H1, the presentation of more idealised online self-images was associated with being younger, having lower self-concept clarity and higher levels of social anxiety. *Author*¹¹ argues that presenting idealised self-images may be the default self-presentation position when one is unclear on how to present the self to others, which could explain why younger individuals with a less clear sense of self are more prone to engage in this behaviour. It also makes sense that social anxiety would drive individuals to present a polished online self-image, given the likelihood of having greater concern that others will judge them harshly if they presented their 'true' selves³⁴, which may also imply that these self-presentations are inauthentic, in line with previous findings³².

Broadly consistent with H2, more diverse self-presentations across multiple platforms was associated with lower self-concept clarity, lower self-esteem and engaging in less self-monitoring. These findings suggest that adults who possess a less clear sense of who they are may benefit, in the same way as adolescents have been shown to, from taking opportunities to try out different self-presentations online as an act of self-discovery¹¹. Having lower self-esteem however may also suggest that some of these individuals are catering their self-presentation styles to different audiences in a bid for approval, perhaps because they are doubtful of being able to make the types of impressions they desire to make^{3,16}. Because low self-monitors are less concerned with what others think about them, their diverse self-presentations, although likely authentic, may represent different aspects of the self which are relevant to specific online environments, which aligns with contemporary perspectives of the self as multidimensional⁵. Future research may benefit from more clearly unpacking the different self-presentation strategies that people use across different online platforms. It is clear that some online platforms provide affordances to users which others do not. For

example, although one might choose to present him/herself anonymously on a discussion forum, that same person's Facebook profile might contain identifying information on them⁵. As a measure of more general online behaviour, the POSS could be modified in future research to test whether a platform's unique affordances interact with different self-presentation styles, e.g. the presentation of an idealised self.

Although self-esteem was not found to be significant, consistent online and offline self-presentation was associated with being younger, having higher self-concept clarity and engaging in more self-monitoring, partially supporting H3. Individuals with a more stable sense of self may convey images that are congruent with their own self-perceptions online and offline, because they are confident about who they are and expect to be accepted by others^{11,16}. That engaging in more self-monitoring was predictive of consistent self-presentation may suggest portraying more idealised self-images across both contexts due to a desire to be liked by others^{25,26}, however further research is needed here to confirm this assertion.

Broadly supporting H4, a preference for presenting the self online was associated with lower self-esteem, higher social anxiety and engaging in less self-monitoring. A preference for being online has often been associated with individuals lacking in social skills (e.g. lower self-esteem and social anxiety), allowing them to compensate for the limitations that their offline personalities place on them³¹. Given that low self-monitors present themselves honestly and authentically, for these individuals a preference for being online might reflect a desire to avoid the more acute consequences for upsetting others face-to-face.

This study explored the influence of self-concept clarity, self-monitoring, self-esteem, and social anxiety on different types of online self-presentation behaviour in adults. Its novel findings offer a more nuanced understanding of how different aspects of personality influence identity formation and self-presentation among adults, and provides further supporting evidence for the necessity to consider the processes involved in online impression management as distinct from offline self-presentation. Moreover, it highlights the need for online impression management research to consider online self-presentation as multifaceted. Given the paucity of scales measuring online self-presentation behaviour, further

evidence for the construct validity of the POSS (by showing the different ways in which different type of online self-presentation experimentation are affected by various personality variables) is encouraging. The study was however limited in terms of having fewer male participants and older adults and future studies using the POSS should use more diverse groups. Given the potential for more flexible self-presentation online and the likelihood that specific personality types (e.g. Machiavellianism) may utilise the affordances of cyberspace for more antisocial means^{41,42}, future research may also wish to explore further whether any negative wellbeing outcomes for the self and others is associated with interacting within a space where people monitor self-presentations very differently.

Author Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

References

1. Turkle S. (1995) *Life on the screen: identity in the age of the Internet*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
2. McKenna KY, Bargh JA. Plan 9 from cyberspace: the implications of the internet for personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 2000; 4(1):57-75.
3. Goffman E. (1990) *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London: Penguin.
4. Bullingham L, Vasconcelos AC. The presentation of self in the online world: Goffman and the study of online identities. *Journal of information science* 2003; 39(1):101-112.
5. Fullwood C (2019) Impression management and self-presentation online. In Attrill-Smith A, Fullwood C, Keep M, Kuss, Eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Cyberpsychology*. OUP, Oxford.
6. Michikyan M, Dennis J, Subrahmanyam K. Can you guess who I am? Real, ideal, and false self-presentation on Facebook among emerging adults. *Emerging Adulthood* 2015; 3:55–64
7. Valkenburg PM, Schouten AP, Peter J. Adolescents' identity experiments on the internet. *New Media & Society* 2005; 7(3):383-402.
8. Walther JB. Selective self-presentation in computer-mediated communication: Hyperpersonal dimensions of technology, language, and cognition. *Computers in Human Behavior* 2007; 23(5):2538-2557.

9. Walther JB, Parks MR. Cues filtered out, cues filtered in. *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication* 2002; 3:529-563.
10. Back MD, Stopfer JM, Vazire S, Gaddis S, Schmuckle SC, Egloff B, Gosling SD. Facebook profiles reflect actual personality, not self-idealisation. *Psychological Science* 2010; 21:372–374.
11. Fullwood C, James B, Chen-Wilson J. Self-concept clarity and online self-presentation in adolescents. *CyberPsychology, Behavior and Social Networking* 2016; 19(12):716-720.
12. Gosling SD, Augustine AA, Vazire S, Holtzman N, Gaddis S. Manifestations of personality in online social networks: self-reported Facebook-related behaviors and observable profile information. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking* 2011; 14:483–488.
13. Marriott TC, Buchanan T. The true self online: Personality correlates of preference for self-expression online, and observer ratings of personality online and offline. *Computers in Human Behavior* 2014; 32:171-177.
14. Wilson RE, Gosling SD, Graham LT. A review of Facebook research in the social sciences. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 2012; 7:203–220.
15. Hall JA, Park N, Song H, Cody MJ. Strategic misrepresentation in online dating: The effects of gender, self-monitoring and personality traits. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 2010; 27(1):117-135.
16. Leary MR, Allen AB. Personality and persona: Personality processes in self-presentation. *Journal of Personality* 2011; 79(6):1191-1218
17. Campbell JD, Trapnell PD, Heine SJ, Katz IM, Lavallee LF, Lehman DR. Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1996; 70(1):141.
18. Strimbu N, O’Connell M. The relationship between self-concept and online presentation in adults. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking* 2019; 22(12):804-807.
19. Manago AM, Graham, MB, Greenfield PM, Salimkhan G. Self-presentation and gender on MySpace. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 2008; 29(6):446-458.
20. Arnett JJ. Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American psychologist* 2000; 55(5):469.
21. Kroger J. (2006) *Identity development: Adolescence through adulthood*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

22. Leone C, Corte V. Concern for self-presentation and self-congruence: Self-monitoring, Machiavellianism, and social contacts. *Social Behavior and Personality* 1994; 22:305–312.
23. Snyder M. (1987) *Public appearances, private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. WH Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.
24. Turnley WH, Bolino MC. Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired images: Exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 2001; 86:351–360.
25. Fandt PM, Ferris GR. The management of information and impressions: When employees behave opportunistically. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 1990; 45:140–158.
26. White CM, Cutello CA, Gummerum M, Hanoch Y. A cross-cultural study of risky online presentation. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking* 2018; 21(1):25-30.
27. Kudret S, Erdogan B, Bauer TN. Self-monitoring personality trait at work: An integrative narrative review and future research directions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 2019; 40(2):193-208.
28. Schlenker BR. (1980) *Impression management*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company Monterey: California.
29. Tice DM. (1993) The social motivations of people with low self-esteem. In Baumeister RF, ed. *Self-esteem: The puzzle of low self-regard*. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 37–53.
30. Baumeister RF. Self-esteem, self-presentation, and future interaction: A dilemma of reputation. *Journal of Personality* 1982; 50:29–45.
31. Joinson AN. Self-esteem, interpersonal risk, and preference for e-mail to face-to-face communication. *CyberPsychology, Social Networking and Behavior* 2004; 7(4):472-478.
32. Twomey C, O'Reilly G. Associations of self-presentation on Facebook with mental health and personality variables: A systematic review. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 2017; 20(10):587-595.
33. Krämer NC, Winter S. Impression management 2.0: The relationship of self-esteem, extraversion, self-efficacy, and self-presentation within social networking sites. *Journal of Media psychology* 2008; 20(3):106-116.
34. Bodroža B, Jovanović T. Validation of the new scale for measuring behaviors of Facebook users: psycho-social aspects of Facebook use (PSAFU). *Computers in Human Behavior* 2016; 54:425–435.

35. McCord B, Rodebaugh TL, Levinson CL. Facebook: social uses and anxiety. *Computers in Human Behavior* 2014; 34:23-27.
36. Sheldon P. The relationship between unwillingness-to-communicate and Facebook use. *Journal of Media Psychology* 2008; 20:67-75.
37. Hinton PR, Brownlow C, McMurray II, Cozens B. (2004). *SPSS explained*. London: Routledge.
38. Leary MR, Kowalski RM. The interaction anxiousness scale: Construct and criterion-related validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 1993; 61(1):136-146.
39. Rosenberg M. (1965) *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
40. Lennox RD, Wolfe RN. Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1984; 46:1349–1364.
41. Abell L, Brewer G. Machiavellianism, self-monitoring, self-promotion and relational aggression on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior* 2014; 36:258-262.
42. Kowalski CM, Rogoza R, Vernon PA, Schermer JA. The Dark Triad and the self-presentation variables of socially desirable responding and self-monitoring. *Personality and Individual Differences* 2018; 120:234-237.